

EXHIBIT A

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Task Force Meeting

April 11, 2005

151 West Mission Street, Rooms 202 A and B

Task Force Members Present:

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams, Chuck Butters, Eric Carruthers, Helen Chapman, Russ Danielson, Gladwyn D'Souza, Doreen Morgan, Chris Platten, Ken Saso, Steve Speno, Neil Struthers, and Terry Watt.

Task Force Members Absent:

Co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales, Supervisor Don Gage, Jim Cunneen, Craige Edgerton, Dan Hancock, Steve Schott Jr., and Phaedra-Ellis Lamkins.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:

Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Shanna Boigon (SCC Association of Realtors), Dawn Cameron (County Roads), Mike Griffis (County Roads), Mary Hughes (Habitat for Humanity), Jane Mark (County Parks), Pat Sausedo (NAIOP), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Tim Steele (Sobrato), Rebecca Van Dahlen (SCC Association of Realtors), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:

Keith Stamps (Council District 2), Emily Moody (Council District 2), Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), John Mills (Council District 6), Rachael Gibson (Don Gage's Office), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Gerry De Guzman (Public Works), Rebecca Flores (Housing), and Luke Vong (DOT).

Consultants Present:

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Thompson (HMH Engineers), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

Community Members Present:

Tom Armstrong, Peter Benson, Waifong Chan, Frank Crane, Richard DeSmet, Gail DeSmet, Francis Doyal, Eric Flippo, Denise Glasco, Paul Hebert, Xay Hoang, Khang Hoang, Jack Kuzia, Pat Kuzia, John Lattyak, Yoon Lee, Ted Leong, Rick Linquist, Chris Marchese, Dennis Martin, Wing Mock, Chou Mock, Lut Mock, Siuwah Mok, Sarah Muller, Ashley Neufeld, Patti O'Connell, Wayne O'Connell, Kirsten Powell, George Reilly, Peter Rothsechild, Annie Saso, Kathleen Seebach, Pauline Seebach, Art Sanchez, Sonja Shurr, Famy Tam, Huimia Tam, Kennedy Tam, Rockey Tam, Wayland Tam, Nathan Wasserman, Don Weden, Kim Weden, John Wills, and Guop Yuan.

1. Welcome:

The meeting convened at 5:30 p.m. with Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams welcoming everyone in attendance to the 31st Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meeting.

2. Acceptance of March 14, 2005 Task Force Meeting Summary:

Co-chair Williams called for a motion to accept the March 14, 2005 Task Force meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Review of Council Progress Report #3:

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, provided an overview of the third progress report presented to the City Council on April 5, 2005. Based on the final motion passed by the Council, staff will provide an informational memorandum to the Rules Committee detailing the range and intent of possible alternatives to be studied in the CVSP Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The City Council's Rules Committee will determine if further public review is necessary to discuss the EIR alternatives.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- Who are the members of the Rules Committee? *Councilmember Williams said that the members of the Rules Committee include Vice Mayor Cindy Chavez and Council members Nora Campos, Judy Chirco and himself.*
- When would the informational memorandum be available prior to the City Council meeting? *Laurel indicated that reports are typically available one week prior to Council meetings.*

4. Work Program:

Laurel reviewed the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Work Program through March 2006. The EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) would be distributed in May. She indicated that the goal is to have the draft specific plan, design guidelines, zoning code and EIR completed by early September 2005.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- Would there be discussion about the NOP at tonight's Task Force meeting as indicated on the Work Program? *Laurel replied in the negative and explained that the NOP would be distributed in late May.*
- What is the relationship between the CVSP EIR and the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)? *Laurel stated that the HCP is a multi-jurisdictional collaborative process between the City of San Jose, Santa Clara County, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) to develop a long-term, comprehensive plan to address habitat issues. CVSP EIR staff and consultants are working closely with a lot of regulatory agencies to identify appropriate mitigation in the CVSP EIR that will nest within the HCP.*

Co-chair Williams asked for comments from the public and the following were provided:

- Brian Schmidt, with the Committee for Green Foothills, asked for a specific date when informational memorandum would be available. He recommended that the memorandum be available after the NOP is distributed, but before the draft EIR begins. Brian hoped that the EIR project alternatives would be discussed at Task Force meetings, as suggested by Councilmember Williams at the April 5, 2005 City Council meeting. *Laurel indicated that she would discuss this with Joe Horwedel, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department in charge of the CVSP EIR, to ascertain the timing of the informational memorandum. She speculated that it would be completed in two to three months.*

5. Review of Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Connections and Movements:

Paul Barber, with KenKay Associates, discussed the major connections between Coyote Valley neighborhoods and the regional non-vehicular systems and networks. He indicated that the CVSP's key infrastructure elements include Fisher Creek, the focal lake, the canal and canal park, the parkway, the in-valley transit and future Caltrain station. The CVSP incorporates five themes necessary for a livable and walkable community—bicycle and pedestrian movements, bicycle and pedestrian connections, bicycle and pedestrian connections to transit, and permeable parkway and trails. Paul explained the principles and goals for the plan's emerging streetscape, the grid street layout, connectivity, a permeable parkway, integrated connections and trails. The CVSP would feature traditional pedestrian and bicycle movements.

Co-chair Williams asked for comments from the Task Force and the following were provided:

- How do you make sure that people will use the pedestrian and bicycle trail systems? *Paul indicated that all streets are designed to create a desirable environment that encourages walkability, and yet are fully functional for vehicles.*
- How do you guarantee that pedestrian and bicycle facilities and levels of service are not compromised as traffic gets worse and improvements are needed for vehicles? *Paul said that they are still working on the traffic level of service. Laurel explained that each area would have a different development policy to allow different standards for traffic levels of service.*
- Indication that trails are generally funded by federal and state grants. *Jim Thompson (HMH) stated that outside agency funding is currently estimated at \$2 million.*
- Special assessment districts should finance the operation and maintenance for trails, tunnels, and medians.
- What are the bicycle trail classifications? *Paul explained that there would be Class 1 multi-use trail systems parallel to the parkway. The parkway is only intended for vehicles. The facilities would have non-vehicular traffic in both directions and would be 12-20 feet in width. Jim indicated that Class 2 systems would be signed and striped along Santa Teresa Boulevard and Monterey Highway. There would be bicycle facilities on all streets.*
- Would the trail systems in Coyote Valley connect with the city's other trail systems? *Paul indicated that the intent is to maximize connectivity, and that the CVSP staff and consultants have been meeting with the City's Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services Department and the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department pursuant to this end. The goal is to create trails that maximize usage and meet the people's needs.*
- Would the proposed trail on the west side of Coyote Creek take additional land? *Concerned that this would impact the net developable acreage. Concerned how this would affect property owners and land dedication. Paul indicated that the trail is currently planned outside of the County land and the 100-foot riparian corridor setback on private property. There will be more discussion of the trail location over the next few weeks.*
- Indication that east side Monterey Highway property owners dedicated 30 percent of their land to the Coyote Creek Parkway years ago and that the CVSP is asking them to dedicate another 30-35 percent. Does not want property owners to be penalized.

- Will pedestrian corridors be considered? *Paul answered in the affirmative.*
- Indication that the elderly have different pedestrian access issues.
- Does the “Connectivity” PowerPoint presentation slide depict all of the proposed pedestrian over and under crossings? *Paul explained that all of the proposed pedestrian over and under crossings along Monterey Highway are not shown. They are still determining where to place additional over and under crossings along the parkway.*
- Are pedestrian undercrossings at Monterey Road and the railroad being considered? *Paul explained that there would be two undercrossings at Monterey Highway and the railroad. They are still working on the engineering concepts to provide access under Monterey Highway and the railroad.*
- Do the preliminary infrastructure costs include the cost of the pedestrian under crossing facilities? *Jim replied in the affirmative. Each crossing would be multi-use.*
- How would you get across the fixed route transit system? Concerned that the transit might separate the community. *Paul explained that the fixed route transit system would have grade separation and would go under the parkway. They are still working on the details for the fixed route transit system design.*
- How will the integrated trail system work for bicyclists to travel north and connect to the transit system? *Paul explained that bicycle and pedestrian systems would go along the parkway and connect with various transit nodes.*
- Recommended making Monterey Highway pedestrian and bicycle friendly.
- Land use should accommodate walking infrastructure, particularly near schools and transit.
- Walking infrastructure would help meet the parking requirements discussed at previous Task Force meetings.
- Does the CVSP still count on transit connections to Caltrain? *Paul explained that they are planning to preserve and enhance existing transit routes going through Coyote Valley, such as VTA bus route 68, which will provide access to the Caltrain station.*
- Concerned with the timing of the CVSP and hopes that it would be approved and implemented soon.
- Recommended finding creative ways to make Coyote Valley unique and livable. Dream is to use golf carts within the community and to use cars outside of the community.

Co-chair Williams asked for comments from the public and the following were provided:

- Eric Flippo indicated that a pedestrian trail is proposed on his and his neighbor’s property in the Greenbelt. He said that no one has talked to him about improvements on his property. *Paul indicated that the consultants would like to discuss this with him.*

6. Public Comments:

- Frank Crane, representing the Mikami family, made a correction to the misprint of his statement from the March 14, 2005 Task Force meeting summary. He is concerned about the

amount of land needed for the Coyote Creek Parkway and did not mean to imply that the Parkway should be eliminated. Frank indicated that the proposed housing in Coyote Valley would help alleviate the housing shortage by providing adequate housing at adequate prices.

- Denise Glasco, with Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning, recommended including the Greenbelt in the EIR since it is a part of the CVSP. Denise indicated that Greenbelt property owners are entitled to their property rights, and should be fairly compensated.
- Brian Schmidt, with the Committee for Green Foothills, indicated that the second wildlife corridor located north of Tulare Hill should be mentioned if it is still being considered. If the wildlife corridor is no longer considered, staff should explain why. Brian said that Coyote Valley should be a revenue generator for the city. He is concerned that Coyote Valley would become self-contained and apply pressure to become its own entity someday.

7. Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:45 p.m. The next Task Force meeting will take place on May 9, 2005.